

## CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM)

## I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Andrew R. Perrong  
1657 The Fairway #131, Jenkintown, PA 19046

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff MONTGOMERY  
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

## (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Andrew R. Perrong (PRO SE)  
1657 The Fairway #131, Jenkintown, PA 19046  
215-791-6957

## DEFENDANTS

MS INTERNATIONAL ENTERPRISES  
8583 Irvine Center Drive #285 IRVINE, CA 92618

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant ORANGE  
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF  
THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

## II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input type="checkbox"/> 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 U.S. Government Defendant	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

## III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

PTF	DEF	PTF	DEF
<input type="checkbox"/> Citizen of This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
<input type="checkbox"/> Citizen of Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
<input type="checkbox"/> Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Foreign Nation	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

## IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability <b>PERSONAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other <b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 <b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395f) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/ Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	<b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b> <b>Habeas Corpus:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <b>Other:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act	<b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 <b>IMMIGRATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions

## V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 Original Proceeding	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Removed from State Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Reinstated or Reopened	<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Transferred from Another District (specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer	<input type="checkbox"/> 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File
---	---	--	---	--	--	---

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 USC 227; 47 CFR 64.1200

## VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Brief description of cause:

Defendants called Plaintiff on his private telephone in violation of the TCPA and related claims.

## VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION  
UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

## DEMAND \$

24,000.00

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND:  Yes  No

## VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

10/18/2018

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING JPF

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

18 4760

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 1657 The Fairway #131 Jenkintown, PA 19046

Address of Defendant: 8583 Irvine Center Drive #285 IRVINE, CA 92618

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: By telephone call to my private telephone

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:

Case Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Judge: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Terminated: \_\_\_\_\_

Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:

1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case  is /  is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 10/18/2018



Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

CIVIL: (Place a ✓ in one category only)

A. Federal Question Cases:

- 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
- 2. FELA
- 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- 4. Antitrust
- 5. Patent
- 6. Labor-Management Relations
- 7. Civil Rights
- 8. Habeas Corpus
- 9. Securities Act(s) Cases
- 10. Social Security Review Cases
- 11. All other Federal Question Cases

(Please specify): TCPA, 47 USC 227

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

- 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- 3. Assault, Defamation
- 4. Marine Personal Injury
- 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Products Liability
- 8. Products Liability – Asbestos
- 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify): \_\_\_\_\_

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION  
(The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)

I, Andrew R. Perrong, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case

exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:

Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 10/18/2018



Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

ANDREW PERRONG

CIVIL ACTION

v.

MS International Enterprises  
Et Al

NO. 18 4760

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

**SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:**

(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ( )

(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )

(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ( )

(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ( )

(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ( )

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (✓)

  
10/18/2018

Date

215-791-6957

Andrew Perrong

Attorney-at-law

888-329-0305

**PLAINTIFF PRO SE**

Attorney for

ANDYPERRONG@GMAIL.COM

Telephone

FAX Number

E-Mail Address

N1QA

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANDREW R. PERRONG )	
1657 The Fairway #131 Jenkintown, PA 19046 )	
)	
)	
Plaintiff, )	Civil Action
vs. )	No. <u>18</u> <del>4760</del>
)	
MS INTERNATIONAL ENTERPRISES )	
("MSIE") d/b/a "Certified Enrollment Center" )	
8583 Irvine Center Drive #285 )	
IRVINE, CA 92618, )	
)	
KASHAN CHARLES RILEY )	
and JANE DARLENE RILEY, )	
Individually and as Principals of MSIE, )	
4000 INNOVATOR DR UNIT 19101, )	
SACRAMENTO, CA 95834, )	
)	
JAWAD NESHEIWAT )	
Individually and as Principal of MSIE )	
2 FOREST ST, )	
LADERA RANCH, CA 92694, )	
)	
and )	
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, )	
)	
Defendants. )	Jury Trial Demanded
)	

Plaintiff ANDREW R. PERRONG brings this action for damages, restitution, reinstatement, statutory damages, punitive damages, sanctions, interest, court costs, and injunctive relief under rights pursuant to Federal Statute under 47 U.S.C. 227, and 47 C.F.R. 64 for the *ultra vires* illegal actions and deliberate and knowing tortious activity of MS INTERNATIONAL ENTERPRISES, ("MSIE") d/b/a "Certified Enrollment Center", KASHAN CHARLES RILEY, JANE DARLENE RILEY, and JAWAD NESHEIWAT, Individually and as Principals of MSIE ("RILEY," and "NESHEIWAT"), and Does 1 through 100, inclusive, in

negligently and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff via Plaintiff's telephone to solicit sales ("Sales Calls"), by utilization of an automatic telephone dialing system, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* and related claims that form part of the same claim or controversy. Plaintiff demands a trial by jury, and complains and alleges as follows:

### **I. Introduction**

1. Defendant MS INTERNATIONAL ENTERPRISES ("MSIE") is a company located and domestically incorporated in the State of California. MSIE does business under the name "Certified Enrollment Center." MSIE markets, and sells, *inter alia*, student loan document preparation and consulting services to individuals throughout Pennsylvania and other states in the US. Its principal mailing address is located at 8583 IRVINE CENTER DRIVE #285 IRVINE, CA 92618.

2. Plaintiff brings this action to challenge Company's practices in the telephone solicitation of their products and services. Specifically, Plaintiff challenges Company's and Company's agents' illegal telephone solicitations by which they markets their products and services, illegal Calls made using an automatic telephone dialing system and robocalls, and failure to maintain a Do-Not-Call policy or list in connection therewith.

3. All of the claims asserted herein arise out of Company's illegal telephone solicitation campaign and are a common fact pattern.

### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

4. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

5. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b)(2), in that

Defendants conduct business in, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to plaintiff's claims occurred in, Pennsylvania's Montgomery County, which lies within this judicial district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §118. Plaintiff received the phone calls to a 215-area code number, registered in this judicial district. Each of the Defendants has sufficient minimum contacts with this District, and otherwise purposely avail themselves of the markets in this District. Also, see *Lary V. The Doctors Answer, LLC* CV-12-S-3510-NE (N.D. Ala. March 8, 2013.), a Federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act case, which held that "venue is proper in the district where [plaintiff] resides because the injury did not occur when the facsimile was sent... ; it occurred when the [facsimile] was received."

## II. Parties

6. Plaintiff ANDREW PERRONG ("Plaintiff") is an individual who received the alleged phone calls and text message on his private cellular telephone line mentioned herein. Plaintiff is an adult individual and citizen of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who may be mailed at 1657 The Fairway #131 Jenkintown, PA 19046.

7. Defendant MS INTERNATIONAL ENTERPRISES ("MSIE") is a company located and domestically incorporated in the State of California. MSIE does business under the name "Certified Enrollment Center." MSIE markets, and sells, *inter alia*, student loan document preparation and consulting services to individuals throughout Pennsylvania. Its principal mailing address and address for service of process is located at 8583 IRVINE CENTER DRIVE #285 IRVINE, CA 92618.

7. Defendants KASHAN CHARLES RILEY and JANE DARLENE RILEY ("RILEY'S") are adult individuals, presumably husband and wife, who are the Primary Owners of MSIE. They RILEY'S are adult individuals, and citizens of the United States. As Principals of

MSIE, the RILEY's are the primary individuals who reap the benefit of the tortious and illegal conduct described herein that is technically carried out only in Company's name. Such tortious, or *ultra vires*, conduct exceeds the permissible actions of corporations both in California, Pennsylvania, and nationwide.

8. Defendant JAWAD NESHEIWAT ("NESHEIWAT") is an adult individual who is another Manager / Principal of MSIE, and who, upon information and belief, manages the website and illegal telephone systems operated by Defendants. As Principal of MSIE, NESHEIWAT is an individual who reaps the benefit of the tortious and illegal conduct described herein that is technically carried out only in Company's name. NESHEIWAT is an adult individual, and citizen of the United States. Such tortious, or *ultra vires*, conduct exceeds the permissible actions of corporations both in California, Pennsylvania, and nationwide.

9. Except as described herein, Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names of Defendants sued as Does 1 through 100, inclusive, and the nature of their wrongful conduct, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of the Court to amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.

10. At all times herein mentioned, MSIE, the RILEY'S, NESHEIWAT, and the Doe Defendants, (collectively, "Defendants"), and each of them, were an agent or joint venture of each of the other, and in doing the acts alleged herein, were acting within the scope of such agency. Each Defendant had actual and/or constructive knowledge of the acts of each of the other Defendants, and ratified, approved, joined in, acquiesced and/or authorized the wrongful acts of each co-Defendant, and/or retained the benefits of said wrongful acts.

11. Defendants, and each of them, aided and abetted, encouraged and rendered substantial

assistance to the other Defendants in committing the wrongful acts alleged herein. In taking action, as particularized herein, to aid and abet and substantially assist the commission of these wrongful acts and other wrongdoing complained of, each of the Defendants acted with an awareness of its primary wrongdoing and realized that its conduct would substantially assist the accomplishment of the wrongful conduct, wrongful goals, and wrongdoing.

12. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants conspired by means of mutual understanding, either expressly or impliedly, among themselves and others in engaging and/or planning to engage in the activities detailed herein to accomplish the wrongful conduct, wrongful goals, and wrongdoing.

13. The TCPA imposes personal liability on individuals who participate in or commission telemarketing calls.

14. Under the TCPA, an individual such as RILEY or NESHEIWAT may be personally liable for the acts alleged in this Complaint pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 217, the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, of which the TCPA is a part, which reads, *inter alia*: “[T]he act, omission, or failure of any agent, or other person acting for or employed by any common carrier or user, acting within the scope of his employment, shall in every case be deemed to be the act, omission, or failure of such carrier or user *as well as of that person.*” 47 U.S.C. § 217 (emphasis added).

15. When considering individual officer liability, other Courts have agreed that a Corporate officer involved in the telemarketing at issue may be personally liable under the TCPA. *See, e.g., Jackson v. Five Star Catering, Inc., v. Beason*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 159985, \*10 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 8, 2013), which stated that “[M]any courts have held that corporate actors

can be individually liable for violating the TCPA where they ‘had direct, personal participation in or personally authorized the conduct found to have violated the statute.’” *See also Maryland v. Universal Elections*, 787 F. Supp. 2d 408, 415-16 (D. Md. 2011), stating that “If an individual acting on behalf of a corporation could avoid individual liability, the TCPA would lose much of its force.”

16. The RILEY’S and NESHEIWAT are personally liable under the “participation theory” of liability because are the Principal owners and controlling officers of MSIE, knew of Company’s violations, and directed employees and/or agents of Company to continue making those violations. Furthermore, the RILEY’S and NESHEIWAT are personally liable because they are personally responsible for ensuring Company’s employees’ TCPA compliance.

### **III. Factual Allegations**

17. In or about October 12<sup>th</sup> , 2018, Plaintiff received a text message made using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”), or robocall, by Defendants and/or their agents at Plaintiff’s personal cellular telephone number, 215-208-9484, for which he is charged for the text message under a package calling arrangement. Plaintiff had not consented to this solicitation, and Plaintiff’s telephone number was on the Federal Do-Not-Call Registry.

18. Under the TCPA, text messages are treated as “calls” and are given the same protection and legal weight as a telephone call. The FCC has stated that the restrictions on making autodialed calls to cell phones encompass both voice calls and texts. *See Rules and Regulations Implementing the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991*, Report and Order, 18 FCC Rcd 14014, 14115, para. 165 (2003).

19. The text message came from the caller ID 224-487-0147 and had the message, “Attn ,

we pre-qualified you for 13k forgiveness in federal loans. Deadline ends Tuesday. Call back at 1 224-487-0147 to complete it.”

20. Based on the generic content of the message, the lack of personalization, and its scripted nature, it is clear that this message was sent *en masse* to thousands of subscribers on or about the same date and time that the plaintiff received his. No normal person composes a text message in such a manner. The text message was clearly sent using a scripted “automatic telephone dialing system” and used an “artificial or prerecorded voice (or text) to transmit a message.”

21. Further proof of the automated nature of the text message is that when one dials the caller ID and number requested, 224-487-0147, one hears an artificial or prerecorded voice asking the caller to press 1 to confirm their interest before the call is transferred to Defendant.

22. On October 17, 2018, Plaintiff dialed the number specified in the text message in an effort to identify the person responsible for it. When Plaintiff dialed the number, he confirmed his “interest” and was transferred to Defendant. Defendant said they would call Plaintiff back, as they claimed Plaintiff’s voice was difficult to hear. Plaintiff told Defendant that he was not interested and that he would call Defendant if he was.

23. Nevertheless, the Plaintiff received an unsolicited call a few seconds later from 949-336-3421. After a short click, delay, and pause filled with call center background noise, the call was connected with “Kenya Henrius.” Plaintiff feigned interest to identify the caller and for no other reason. Plaintiff provided an e-mail address from which to receive an e-mail from the agent he spoke with. Plaintiff received an e-mail from “Kenya Henrius” ([kenyah@certifiedec.com](mailto:kenyah@certifiedec.com)) at “Certified Enrollment Center” with the website [certifiedenrollmentcenter.com](http://certifiedenrollmentcenter.com). Both [certifiedenrollmentcenter.com](http://certifiedenrollmentcenter.com) and [certifiedec.com](http://certifiedec.com) are registered to Defendant NESHEIWAT.

24. Plaintiff said that he received the email, and that he needed time to research the company, and would call back again if he had any interest.

25. The call was clearly made using an ATDS, or Automatic Telephone Dialing system, because of the extremely short time for a callback after Plaintiff terminated the initial call, and because of the telltale click, delay, and pause before Kenya's voice could be heard on the line.

26. Thereafter, Plaintiff contacted Defendants and requested to be placed on Defendants' Do-Not-Call List and receive a copy of Defendants' Do-Not-Call policy, but never received anything, up to and including the date of this filing.

27. Despite Plaintiff saying that he would call Defendants if and only if and when he was interested, Plaintiff received a call from the same caller ID, 949-336-3421 at approximately 10:18 AM on October 18. Plaintiff missed the call, but rather than leave a message, Defendants immediately called back at 10:19 AM. Often Automatic Telephone Dialing Systems will initiate an immediate call back rather than attempt to leave a message.

28. Plaintiff answered the call at 10:19, and after a short click, delay, and pause filled with call center background noise, Plaintiff was connected to "Kenya" from the other day. Plaintiff reiterated his requests not to be contacted and said that he would contact Defendants if he was interested.

29. Because Plaintiff asked to receive Defendants' Do-Not-Call policy and did not, it is evident that Defendants do not maintain such a policy. Likewise, based on this fact, and the fact that Plaintiff asked twice not to be contacted but was still contacted, it is clear that Defendants do not have any Do-Not-Call lists or procedures in place. Based on the nature of their illegal activities, Defendants' noncompliance with the law in this regard is unsurprising.

30. To the best of Plaintiff's knowledge, none of the Defendants are licensed under any

authority or capacity to service, collect, or negotiate student loan programs and payments.

31. Plaintiff received the calls on his private cellular telephone, which is, in addition to being a cellular telephone, is a telephone for which he is charged for the calls, as defined and set forth in 47 CFR § 64.1200(a)(1)(iii).

32. The TCPA makes it unlawful “to make any call (other than a call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using an automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial or prerecorded voice... to any telephone number assigned to a... cellular telephone service... or any service for which the called party is charged for the call.” *See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).* As stated immediately above, the calls were placed using an automatic telephone dialing system to Plaintiff’s private cellular telephone line, on which he is charged for the call.

33. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A). *See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).*

34. The TCPA provides a private cause of action to persons who receive calls in violation of any of the implementing regulations codified in 47 CFR 64.1200. *See 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).*

35. Plaintiff was harmed by the calls. He was temporarily deprived of legitimate use of his phone because his phone line was tied up, it used up his minutes, he wasted energy and stress in answering a call, his telephone batteries and electricity were depleted, he was charged for the calls, and his privacy was improperly invaded. Moreover, the calls injured plaintiff because they were frustrating, obnoxious, annoying, were a nuisance and disturbed the solitude of Plaintiff.

36. Plaintiff adequately confirmed corporate identity for each and every call so as to establish liability of Defendants, as more fully outlined above.

37. These telephone solicitations constituted "calls" under the TCPA that were not for emergency purposes.

38. Plaintiff did not provide any one, more, or all Defendants, nor any agent of Defendants, prior express written consent, or any other form of consent, express or implied, to cause Plaintiff to receive telephone calls on his personal telephone that utilized an "automatic telephone dialing system" or otherwise to transmit a message or make calls.

39. As a point of fact, to the extent that "consent" was supplied during the calls, that was done in order to discover the identity of the caller and for no other reason. Courts have held this to be legitimate and have not held such "consent" to be detrimental to a plaintiff bringing a TCPA action. *See* for instance, *Bank v. Caribbean Cruise Line*, which held that "Purporting to obtain consent during the call, such as requesting that a consumer "press 1" to receive further information, does not constitute the prior consent necessary to deliver the message in the first place, as the request to "press 1" is part of the telemarketing call.... As the FCC has stated, the consent must be made before the call."

40. Plaintiff had no prior business relationship with any one, more, or all of Defendants.

41. The telephone Sales Calls therefore violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F), 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(1), 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(3), 47 CFR § 64.1200(a)(1)(iii), 47 CFR § 64.1200(a)(1), and 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2).

#### **IV. Causes Of Action**

##### **First Cause of Action**

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "ATDS" Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

42. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

43. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

44. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

### **Second Cause of Action**

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA  
“ATDS” Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

45. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

46. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A), Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3).

47. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

### **Third Cause of Action**

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA “Sales Call/DNC” Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

48. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

49. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F), and 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F).

50. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting

such conduct in the future.

**Fourth Cause of Action**

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA  
“Sales Call/DNC” Prohibition, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.)

51. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

52. As a result of Defendants’ and Defendants’ agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(3)(F), and 47 C.F.R. 64.1200(c)(2), Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as provided by statute, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

53. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(A), Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

**Fifth Cause of Action**

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA “Do-Not-Call Policy” Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

54. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

55. As a result of Defendants’ and Defendants’ agents negligent violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

**Sixth Cause of Action**

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA  
“Do-Not-Call Policy” Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

56. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the

paragraphs above.

57. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(1) Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as implied, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

**Seventh Cause of Action**

(Negligent Violation of the TCPA "Do-Not-Call List" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

58. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

59. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents negligent violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(3), Plaintiff seeks for himself \$500 in statutory damages for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

**Eighth Cause of Action**

(Knowing and/or Willful Violation of the TCPA  
"Do-Not-Call List" Requirement, 47 CFR 64.1200 et seq.)

60. Plaintiff incorporates and realleges, as though fully set forth herein, each of the paragraphs above.

61. As a result of Defendants' and Defendants' agents knowing and/or willful violations of 47 CFR 64.1200(d)(3) Plaintiff seeks for himself treble damages, as implied, up to \$1,500.00 for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5).

**WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for relief against defendants, and each of them, as follows:**

**V.      Prayer for Relief**

On Causes of Action 1-8:

1. For awards of \$500 for each negligent violation as set forth in actions 1-8;
2. For awards of \$1,500 for each knowing/willful violation as set forth in actions 1-8.
3. Injunctive relief against Defendants, and each of them, to prevent future wrongdoing;  
Total statutory damages: : \$24,000 (Four counts each of: sales call/text, ATDS call/text, failure to put Plaintiff's number on Defendants' Do-Not-Call list, and failure to provide Plaintiff a copy of Defendants' Do-Not-Call policy, at \$500 per count of each, with treble damages for each.)
4. Punitive damages to punish Defendants for their willful, illegal, and deliberate tortious conduct and to deter others who may otherwise engage in similar willful illegal and deliberate tortious conduct;
5. Prejudgment interest at the maximum legal rate;
6. Costs of suit herein incurred; and
7. All such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

**VI. Demand for Jury Trial**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims so triable.

Dated: **October 18, 2018**



/s/  
Andrew Perrong  
*Plaintiff Pro-Se*  
1657 The Fairway #131  
Jenkintown, PA 19046  
Phone: 215-791-6957  
Facsimile: 888-329-0305  
andyperrong@gmail.com